Tells the Facts and Names the Names

CounterPunch

JANUARY 16-31, 1999 *Ken Silverstein & Alexander Cockburn* **VOL. 6, NO. 2**

■ IN THIS ISSUE

PUBLIC RADIO'S DEADLY EROSION

- How Nice People Having Been Prepping Pacifica for a Safe Corporate Future
- KPFA, KPFK, WBAI and Other Stations Now Worth $200 Million
- Big Showdown in Berkeley at End of February
- One Law for the Poor, Another for Larry Bensky

WHEN STROM WAS YOUNG AND DINOSAURS RULED

- Seduction in the Shadow of Old Sparky

THE LATE GREAT BILL OF RIGHTS

- Tony Serra Counts Freedom's Losses

The Neutering of Pacifica

Those involved with public radio are sadly familiar with the largely silent privatization of the small slice of the FM broadcast spectrum set aside for non-commercial purposes. At small public radio outlets, the process has often been brutally abrupt, with little resistance. In contrast, at Pacifica Radio, the largest and most powerful public radio broadcaster (NPR is a program service, not a station-owner), the struggle for control has been protracted and often ugly, though almost never public. This struggle is nearing its climax, as the Pacifica board of governors will vote on the weekend of February 26-28 to alter the by-laws of the foundation regarding who, in the future, will select the Pacifica board of governors, perhaps giving itself, for the first time, majority control over its own composition. These are the men and women who control the disposition of the $200 million-plus in assets of the Pacifica Foundation. Never heard of them? Don't feel bad. Almost no one has, and even as it stands now, almost no one gets to vote for them. They're worth knowing though, because these days they and the handful of executives they directly or indirectly hire, and no one else, decides what you will hear, and what you won't, on Pacifica Radio.

The Pacifica Foundation holds the broadcast licenses for FM radio stations in New York City (WBAI), Los Angeles (KPFK), Berkeley/San Francisco Bay Area (KPFA), Washington DC (WPFW) and Houston (KPFT). The station in Los Angeles is the strongest FM signal west of the Mississippi and WBAI, New York transmits its broadcasts from the choicest of locations atop the Empire State Building. In sum, Pacifica signals can reach approximately one in five U.S. households. The stations in New York and the SF Bay Area have broadcast frequencies in the commercial part of the spectrum, and thus have sale values estimated in 1996 at $90 and $60 million, respectively, although a more reasonable estimate today might be closer to twice that. Including the Pacifica Radio Archives and the various real-estate holdings (station sites) owned by the Foundation, the total value of the Foundation assets certainly exceed $200 million and perhaps may reach above $300 million.

If indeed the 'privatization' battle has been most bitter at Pacifica, perhaps it is not so much because of its immense value, but because Pacifica originated the concept of listener-sponsorship in order to support the founding ethic of programming freedom in service of a mission. It has been populated and listened to by people who believed that the institution existed for that purpose. People with such beliefs are bound to put up a fuss when an administration informs them that the original values have no value when compared to that of a bigger audience making bigger donations. Pacifica founder Lewis Hill's vision was that the people producing the broadcast had to have control over the policy governing their actions. He wrote:

"Since [fundamental] values and expressions...are what we must have to improve radio noticeably, there is no choice but to begin by extending to someone the privilege of thinking and acting in ways important to him. Whatever else may happen, we thus assign to the participating individual the responsibility, artistic integrity, freedom of expression, and the like, which in conventional radio is normally denied him. KPFA is operated literally on this principle."

Pacifica has always been relevant not only because it did not accept corporate underwriting, but because it operated in a manner different from the corportions it criticized. But Pacifica is now being

(Pacifica *continued on page 4)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Little Secret

It's Not the Economy

There's a long-term fallacy nourished by the pundits: that Bill owes his popularity in the polls to the ebullience of the stock market and the upward arc of the Dow Jones industrial index across the past year. This is nonsense. The people who give Clinton his greatest strength in the polls—lower-income blue-collar—have not been doing particularly well in recent months, nor indeed in recent years. American workers are taking home in real terms roughly what they were in 1979. Those who have been doing well in economic terms are those more likely to disapprove of Clinton's conduct and to support impeachment.

Strom and Sue

The senator with the longest and steamiest past is of course Strom Thurmond, a man so legendary in his satyriasis that Lyndon Johnson's daughter Lynda once said that when Thurmond, then almost 60, asked her to go bike riding with him in the Washington suburbs, her father—for the only time in her dating years—said no. This story comes from a biography of Thurmond, Ol' Strom, written by Jack Bass and Marilyn Thompson and published last year. It has plenty of good stuff in it, not least concerning Thurmond's fervid pursuit of women, which once prompted Sen. John Tower to make the famous remark—often attributed to Thurmond himself—that "When he dies, they'll have to beat his pecker down with a baseball bat in order to close the coffin lid".

In the early 1940s, when Thurmond was a judge in South Carolina, the state was convulsed by the saga of Sue Logue, a woman whose husband, J. Wallace Logue, was shot dead by his neighbor Davis Timmerman in a dispute over the price of a calf. Logue brooded and vowed revenge. She retained the services of a family friend who was also a local cop, who in turn hired a man to kill Timmerman. With Timmerman dead, it wasn't long before the killer told all, and police cars were mustered outside Sue Logue's farmhouse. It was a standoff until Thurmond arrived at the scene, turned out his pockets to show he was unarmed and was admitted into Logue's house, where he duly persuaded the denizens, include Sue, to give themselves up.

Thurmond's sexual escapades make Clinton look like a piker by comparison.

The local view was that Logue had reason to trust Thurmond, not least because they had been having an affair for some time. Three weeks after Thurmond escorted Logue out of her house, the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and Thurmond volunteered for duty. One view in South Carolina, cited by Bass and Thompson, was that he was eager to escape the rumors now circulating throughout the region. As the authors write: "The stories still whispered in Edgefield tell of Strom's long affair with Sue, who campaigned for him when he ran for county superintendent of education and whom he allowed to teach in the county schools despite unwritten rules generally excluding married women from teaching positions. Her reputation for sexual prowess was such that men told stories of her reputed vaginal muscular dexterity. The lore includes a tale of her and Strom found flagrante delicto in the superintendent's office."

By the time Thurmond got orders to report for active duty in April 1942, Sue Logue and her associates had been convicted and sentenced to death. The three were killed in the electric chair on Jan. 15, 1943, Sue Logue being the first woman ever electrocuted in South Carolina. Bass and Thompson write, "Randall Johnson, a black man who supervised 'colored help' at the State House and often served as driver and messenger, drove Sue from the women's penitentiary to the death house at the main penitentiary in Columbia. In the back seat with her, he said many years later, was Thurmond; then an Army officer on active duty. They were 'a-huggin' and a-kissin' the whole day,' said Johnson, whom Thurmond later as governor considered a trusted driver... In whispered 'graveyard talk'—the kind of stories not to be told outsiders—the word around SLED (State Law Enforcement Division) was that Joe Frank said his aunt Sue was the only person seduced on the way to the electric chair."

So much for Strom, only minutes away from necrophilia. His sexual escapades make Bill Clinton look like a piker. In contrast to Thurmond's intimacy with the condemned, the best Clinton could do was take Mary Steenburgen out to dinner the night Arkansas restored in practical application the death penalty. Clinton was governor at the time and was supposedly on call, in case he decided to commute a pending sentence.

As he ogled Steenburgen, the phone in the death house remained silent and the condemned man fried. As Alexander Pope wrote in The Rape of the Lock: "The hungry judges soon the sentence sign,/ And wretches hang that jurymen may dine."

10th Circuit Madness

Sue Logue's nephew escaped death by testifying against her, and this brings us to the regrettable decision of the 10th Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals on Jan. 8 to reverse the three-judge decision last year that held that a prosecutorial offer of leniency to a co-defendant in return for testimony constituted an unlawful bribe,

Editors
Ken Silverstein
Alexander Cockburn

Co-writer
Jeffrey St. Clair

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions,
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch welcomes all tips, information and suggestions.
CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-986-3665 (phone)
202-986-0974 (fax)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contravening 18 USC section 201 (c)(2), the so-called "anti-gratuity statute."

The case involved Sonya Singleton, who was convicted of money laundering and conspiring to sell cocaine. Her co-defendant, Napoleon Douglas, testified against her in return for a government promise to not prosecute him for related offenses, to advise the sentencing court of his cooperation and to tell a state parole board about his cooperation. Singleton's lawyers claimed this violated the anti-gratuity statute.

A three-judge panel decision agreed, and had their view been upheld, the effect might have been as far-reaching as was the Miranda decision saying police had to alert suspects to their rights as defendants. When the Miranda decision came down from Chief Justice Earl Warren in 1966, there were as dire predictions of chaos in the administration of justice as were made after the three-judge Singleton decision.

The majority decision reversing last year's three-judge verdict was written by 10th Circuit Judge John Porfilio, who changed his name from John P. Moore a few years ago, and who is a former Colorado prosecutor put on the federal bench in the Reagan years. Porfilio homed in on the language of the anti-gratuity statute, which begins, "Whoever...directly or indirectly, gives, offers, or promises anything of value to any person, for or because of the testimony under oath...shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both."

Porfilio held that "whoever" could not apply to the prosecutor, which is the federal government. "Whoever" can only apply to people. And because the federal government traces its prosecutorial powers from the British sovereign, no U.S. statute can apply to it, because of "vested sovereign prerogative...the special right of kings." So there you have it: the right to reward snitches is protected by the divine right of kings! Porfilio did not shrink from his own logic: "We simply believe this particular statute does not exist for the government."

Other judges agreeing with Porfilio that the earlier decision be reversed did not go along with his peculiar arguments. Indeed Judge Lucero tactfully declared Porfilio's reasoning "conceptually messy." Lucero argued that specific immunity statutes are indeed, as the U.S. Supreme Court once defined them, "essential to the effective enforcement of various criminal statutes...and so familiar that they have become part of our 'constitutional fabric.'"

The three dissenting judges (the same three, including Chief Judge Seymour who ruled in the initial Singleton decision) held, in the words of their dissent, that the plain meaning of the anti-gratuity statute is beyond dispute and the prohibition against offering "anything of value" applies to prosecutors as well as defenders. If a different law is desired, it is up to Congress to pass one. It may be that because Judge Porfilio's decision was so bizarre, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear the case, if only to have one of the main props in the administration of U.S. justice rest on a foundation steadier than that offered by Porfilio.

The right to reward snitches is protected by the divine right of kings.

LAST WORD FROM LBJ

The senators sitting in judgment of Bill might refresh their sense of presidential dignity by consulting Ron Kessler's book Inside the White House: "Lyndon Johnson was furious. Johnson's wife, Lady Bird, had caught him having sex on a sofa in the Oval Office with one of the handful of gorgeous young secretaries he had hired. Johnson blamed it all on the Secret Service, which safeguarded the Oval Office and the rest of the White House. He said, 'You should have done something,' recalled a Secret Service agent. "We said, 'we don't do that. That's your problem.'" Eventually LBJ arranged for a buzzer to sound in his office when Lady Bird left the domestic sector of the White House and headed his way.

SERRA ON JUSTICE

Ask us who are the salt of the earth, and we will tell you, criminal defense attornies. For many an unfortunate they are the first and last line of defense, and even though the criminal bar has its share of frauds and dead-beats, the criminal defense bar is packed with selfless types who work extremely hard for not much money. They see the system in all its arrogance and cruelty, and fight it every day.

One of the best defense attornies on the west coast is Tony Serra, famous for defending native Americans. He defended Bear Lincoln, charged with killing a sheriff's deputy in Mendocino county, California. Serra got Bear off the capital charges.

At that time Serra gave a striking account of what he called the KGB-ing of America. From time to time, in speech or print, he reprises the theme, and it is worth repeating.

Problem number one: snitches. Ever since torture ("the Third Degree") was phased out in the early 1930s as the prime investigative tool of law enforcement, the culture of snitching has metastasized. As Serra says, "we probably have more nomenclature for informants than does any other culture. We have citizen informants, confidential informants, informants who are percipient, informants who are participatory, informants who are merely eyewitnesses, informants who are co-defendants, informants who precipitate charges by reverse stings. Our system is permeated by the witness or the provocateur who is paid by government for a role in either revealing or instigating a crime."

If defense attornies went out and bought witnesses they'd be hit with charges of obstructing justice. But prosecutors routinely slide witnesses wads of cash and hold out that infinitely potent bribe, freedom, or the prospect of freedom on an accelerated schedule. Ask yourself, how great is the power of a bribe to knock ten years off a prison term? What's that worth in cash? What cash is the equivalent of ten years' liberty?

And so the texture of criminal justice is that of snitching, of confecting false testimony, of bearing false witness. The beating heart of the criminal justice system today is the snitch.

Serra's next complaint is about grand juries, whose use has grown at a staggering rate over the past generation.

"Today," Serra points out, "99.9 per cent of all federal cases involve indictment by grand jury. That means no preliminary hearing, no discovery prior to indictment, no confrontation, no lawyer present on behalf of the accused." (Unless you happen to be Bill Clinton, president of the United States.) "The accused isn't there, and doesn't see, hear, confront, cross-examine his or her accusers." It can be a felony to disclose anything that happened or what your testimony actually was. We were giving a lurid illustration of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abuses this secrecy can engender when Monica Lewinsky's actual grand jury testimony was made public. We were able to compare her words with independent counsel Ken Starr's misrepresentation of them in his report to congress.

Serra rightly indicts the grand jury system — originally developed in English common law as a means to go after the rich and powerful, and now used as "an instrument of oppression... another secret tool of an expanding executive branch."

Next: mandatory sentences, which are an obvious abuse of the constitutional principle of separation of powers, since the law enforcement agencies now stipulate the sentences and the judiciary has to go along. Serra defines this abuse well: "When mandatory sentencing occurs, the legislative, actualized by the executive, has swallowed up the judiciary, which becomes a rubber stamp."

Serra finally points his finger at the eroding of bail. These days there's a presumption against bail, and consequently an onslaught on the fundamental presumption of innocence. The jails are filled with unconvicted people.

And finally, there is the constitutional right to a "speedy trial" - a right fast becoming a joke, as people languish behind bars for a year or more, with no more legal representative speed than a drowsy snail.

There you have it. The cops abuse your fourth amendment protections against unreasonable search and seizure and arrest you; you are either denied bail or find bail set at a prohibitive level; so you sit in jail for a year, after which a jailhouse snitch tells the prosecutors you confessed to him; you go up before a jury and are convicted on the basis of false testimony, and mandatory sentencing puts you away for fifteen years.

Ken's Move

With this issue, Ken Silverstein, who founded CounterPunch back in 1993, will be moving on to work as a full-time freelance writer. His slot on our masthead will be taken by long-time CounterPunch co-writer Jeffrey St. Clair. Ken, who will continue to write for the newsletter, especially thanks CounterPunch's loyal subscribers for making all of our work possible these past five years. Readers wishing to contact Ken after Feb. 5 can call 202-462-3130 or write to him at our current address. ■

(**Pacifica**, *continued from p. 1*)

refashioned in the image of such corporations, using corporate measures of value to gauge its successes and failures.

In a 1992 article entitled "Why Public Radio Isn't", Rachel Anne Goodman, writing in the Whole Earth Catalog, described a trend sweeping the country: that sliver of broadcast spectrum reserved for civic purposes known as public radio was being put on a market standard. Target audiences were identified and programming tailored to their tastes supplanted previously diverse formats. The administrators of public stations, large and small, were acting aggressively to remove staff, volunteers, and community members from any meaningful say in what those stations aired, and how they would be run. Goodman suggested that the distinct similarity of this process occurring at stations across the country could be traced to a document coming out of National Public Radio in 1986 - the "Audience-Building Task Force Report".

Pacifica is being refashioned in a corporate image, using corporate measures of values.

In that same year of 1992, Pacifica Radio's national management in Berkeley drafted an internal document, "Strategy for National Programming", a blueprint for syndicated programming intended to compete with NPR's news and public affairs offerings sold to non-commercial stations across the country. Local Pacifica stations would be required to carry these programs in place of locally produced material. The planners hoped to persuade major foundations, which had refused to fund Pacifica in the past, to help finance this project. They envisioned the recruitment of a staff of paid professionals to replace the local volunteer broadcasters who had been the backbone of the organization since its inception, and, for the first time in Pacifica's history, to dictate programming from the top, as in a conventional network hierarchy.

In 1993, word of the plans began to leak out in Berkeley and some KPFA staff and concerned community members began to organize resistance against Pat Scott, general manager of KPFA. As a result, Scott was ousted and transferred by David Salniker, then KPFA gauleiter and now of the Tides Foundation, to the post of Pacifica lobbyist in Washington. In late 1994, Scott became the Pacifica Foundation's executive director. The changes that were taking place and those to come were indicated in a memo from Scott dated July 12, 1995, which froze membership of all advisory boards and noted: "In light of the vast changes that are to occur at all stations, the executive committee of the Pacifica Foundation National Board believes it is necessary to issue an interim set of guidelines that supercede the local station by-laws so that you will have a clear understanding of our expectations of your role during this period.

"The Local Advisory board is, hereby, directed not to take action that will impede the plans of the station staff. Members of any local Board who do not feel that they can assist Pacifica in its present mission are advised to resign. If there are indications that actions are being taken collectively or individually to countermand the policies, directives, and mandates of the Pacifica Board, the Board will take appropriate steps."

In the succeeding period members of local station management and advisory boards who opposed these trends were fired or forced to resign. Reports of union-busting emanated from the unionized shops in New York and Berkeley, and these were given credence by the news that Pacifica had retained the American Consulting Group, a notorious union-busting consulting firm, to provide advice and support in its union negotiations. Station folios, monthly communiques from the stations to their subscribers, were reduced in size and finally eliminated. Purges of volunteers and staff led to several hundred people network-wide being removed.

At least a dozen people were banned from Pacifica for publicly criticizing adminstration policies and actions. In Los Angeles, following the removal of radical black programmers who violated Pacifica's "dirty laundry rule" by airing a show discussing the treatment of black programmers at Pacifica. KPFK's general manager Mark Schubb posted a prohibition not only of on-air discussion of Pacifica policy but also of announcements of meetings at which Pacifica policy would be discussed. It seems this gag rule only applies to disfavored programmers. In late

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1998, when longtime Pacifica programmer Larry Bensky complained on-air about the abrupt cancellation of his national daily program and his treatment at the hands of Pacifica, he was rewarded with a weekend show rather than being permanently banned in the manner of those who had previously attempted to speak out. At the upcoming February 28 meeting in Berkeley, a petition signed by present and former Pacifica staffers, also by listener-sponsors, will demand public apologies to and offers of reinstatement of the banned programmers.

In the mid-1990s, singificant manuevers began at the highest level of the institution, the Pacifica Governing Board. In a complaint to an Inspector General of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, a group of concerned listeners and former station volunteers in the SF Bay Area known as Take Back KPFA charged that "since February, 1995, Pacifica Board Secretary Mary Tilson has refused to make minutes of the Board's meetings public, saying that she has been advised by Pacifica's legal counsel that such documents are for the use of the board and are not subject to public inspection." In the CPB Inspector General's report, the executive summary stated: "Pacifica Foundation was not allowing the public to observe their board deliberations; the drafters of the Communications Act intended for governing board proceedings to be open to the public. The Foundation had obtained legal counsel regarding the issue and felt it was abiding by the Act provisions. However, the opening of board of directors' meetings for one hour to just listen to public comments does not comply with legal requirements which reads that, 'All persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting of the board, or of any such committee or body, ...' The statute allows closed sessions for only those reasons specifically stated therein. Deliberations being held in closed session did not meet the criteria specified in the statute. Staff personnel stated that Board meetings use (sic) to be open, until the Board started having problems with the public."

This contention was disputed by Scott, who travelled to Washington to make a presentation before the CPB board. In the event, Jack O'Dell, Pacifica's chairman decided to do the job himself. Ultimately, the board did not take any punitive action whatsoever with respect to Pacifica.

In 1997 came a crucial step in the 'privatization' drive. The governing board of Pacifica attempted to change its by-laws to give itself, for the first time, majority control over its own membership. At the time, the board comprised fifteen seats. Ten of these were filled by two nominees from each of the five member stations' community advisory boards, along with five at-large members selected by the Pacifica board. The Board proposed that it select one of the two nominees from each member station's advisory board, and that it additionally select one other person of its own choosing from each station signal area. In other words, the Pacifica governing board, which up to that point only had control over one-third of its members (the at-large directors), wanted direct control of two-thirds of its membership, and elective control over the remaining third.

Rather than being banned Bensky was rewarded with a weekend show.

The newly-hired communications director, Burt Glass, formerly with the U.S. Justice Department's community policing program, issued what he termed a "cheat sheet" describing how Pacifica staff and board members should disguise the scheduled changes with verbal fluff.

The proposed governance changes were to be enacted by the governing board at its June 1997 meeting. But there was still considerable resistance within the board, and the vote on the key section of the governance change was delayed until the subsequent meeting, so that the language of the change could be altered. Following the June 1997 meeting, governing board member (and board secretary) Roberta Brooks, a longtime aide of congressman Ron Dellums, made outrageously misleading statements to the press and to the KPFA advisory board asserting that the by-law changes were already a done deal. At the September 1997 meeting in Washington DC at which the crucial by-laws change was to finally occur, dissident groups sent attorney Daniel M. Siegel to document what appeared to be violations of the procedures for altering by-laws. Ultimately, the Board abandoned the attempt to alter the by-laws, and instead voted simply to increase the number of at-large members to nine (of a total nineteen board members).

At the same September 1997 Pacifica national board meeting, new board chair Mary Frances Berry was seated. Thenceforth, considerably more order was imposed upon what had been a markedly unruly organization. The pace of firings and removals moderated. National board meeting transcripts and minutes began to be posted on the Pacifica web site (http://www.pacifica.org). And in mid-1998, Scott announced her impending resignation. Although Pacifica remained radically altered from its pre-1995 state, it appeared as though the organization were on a steadier course, with the administration demonstrating greater respect for its own rules of operation.

But within a year, the question of governance, of how those who control these $200-$300 million in unique broadcasting assets will be selected, resurfaced again. At the October 1998 national board meeting, the board voted unanimously to alter Pacifica's governance structure at its subsequent board meeting to be held February 26-28 in Berkeley. The purported impetus to change the by-laws regarding election of Pacifica Governing Board members ostensibly came from the CPB (which provides a matching grant based on community support amounting to approximately 20% of Pacifica's budget). It

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year individual, $40
One year institution, $100
One year student/low income, $30
Please send back issue(s)
_____($3/issue)
"I am enclosing a separate sheet for gift subscriptions"

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order.
Add $10 for foreign subscriptions.
Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**
Return to: **CounterPunch.**
PO Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not possible to know what precisely occurred since, as of this writing, the transcripts and minutes of this meeting, in contrast to those for the preceding year, have not been posted. However, the decision to change by-laws in part resulted from a letter from CPB president and CEO Robert Coonrod to outgoing Scott in response to her request for clarification about Pacifica's compliance with CPB regulations. Specifically, Scott inquired whether the present structure of Pacifica, in which each Pacifica station advisory board nominates two of their number to serve on the Pacifica Governing Board, violates CPB rules indicating a separation of governance and advisory board functions. Before he joined CPB in 1992, Coonrod was deputy director of Voice of America, the Office of Cuba Broadcasting (both Radio and TV Marti), and Worldnet Television and Film Service. Coonrod responded that it was his opinion that Pacifica's structure did indeed violate CPB rules. However, the rules he spoke of have not substantively changed since at least 1978. Still the apparent threat of losing CPB grant money, and the possible negative impacts of that loss on future spectrum allocations when the shift to digital broadcasting occurs, seems to have convinced the Pacifica governing board that it now must change how it elects itself. Some have the suspicion that the canvassing of CPB opinion by Scott and Coonrod's response were a collusive operation.

The impending change in Pacifica's by-laws will alter the method of selection of governing board members, with the board deciding how it will be composed in the future. Very few within the institution and almost no one outside of it is presently aware of this impending change in ownership. Advisory boards have been asked for their comments and suggestions on the governance change, but no information is presently available concerning the proposals being considered by the Pacifica governing board on this point. Materials including the relavent CPB regulations, as well as the opinion of Pacifica's counsel, John Crigler, of Haley, Bader and Potts, have been circulated within the organization. An attorney familiar with the Pacifica situation comments thus to CounterPunch: "Frankly, from a lawyer's point of view, the whole thing makes no sense. Normally Pacifica's lawyer would give the reasons why Pacifica's ok, not agree with nonsense saying it has been illegal for over a dozen years. No lawyer would intentionally allow his opinion to be distributed like this, because it waives the attorney-client privilege...unless the people in control want the change."

"Frankly, from a lawyer's point-of-view the whole thing makes no sense ... Unless the people in control want the change."

Whose institution is it? Whose will it be? Is this Governing Board likely to choose a structure of governance giving any other group within Pacifica, including its subscribers, any say in who gets to make the meaningful decisions at Pacifica? Or will it instead grant itself permanent control of its own composition?

The most confounding part of this sad saga is the likelihood that most of the men and women making this decision are well-meaning people who hold dear one or another stripe of 'progressive' values. From their position, they may well believe that they are acting to save Pacifica, protecting it from assault by present and future foes. They may not trust the motives of programmers, staff, volunteers, or subscribers. If one is to believe their public statements, they are solely concerned with expanding Pacifica's audiences beyond their present scope, and insuring financial growth. Yet the vision they have of how this is to be done, and why, is not now or ever to be open to challenge. It is hard for autocrats to find their own power objectionable.

So what will happen to Pacifica, emblem of listener-supported public radio, thorn in the flank of business-as-usual? What will the governing board propose to itself? This article is intended to be a contribution to debate leading up to the February 26-28 meeting in Berkeley. CounterPunchers and friends of Pacifica in the Bay Area can stop by in Berkeley at the meeting to make their voices heard. As matters stood in late January, only the final day is presently scheduled to be open to the public. On Pacifica's agenda, public comment is ranked last.

For more details and the petition mentioned above see www.radio4all.org/freepacifica. ■

CounterPunch
P.O. Box 18675
Washington, DC 20036

Presorted
First Class Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 269
Skokie, IL

First Class Mail

Tony Serra on the late great Bill of Rights

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED